



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,480	11/13/2003	William L. Ball	GP-303855 (2760/120)	8336
7590 03/17/2009 General Motors Corporation Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000				
EXAMINER				
PASS, NATALIE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3686				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,480

Applicant(s)

BALL, WILLIAM L.

Examiner

Natalie A. Pass

Art Unit

3686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13, 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 3 December 2008. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13, 16-18 have been amended. Claims 4-6, 8, 12, 14-15 have been canceled. Claims 19-22 have been newly added. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13, 16-22 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 9, 11, 13, 17, 20, 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rieser et al., (2001/0034223).

(A) As per claim 11, Rieser teaches a method for providing medical information of a vehicle user, the method comprising:

storing a “unique transmitter ID number” (reads on “an encryption code”) in a key device, the encryption code associated with the medical information stored in a database (Reiser; Figure 2B, Item 255, paragraphs [0026]-[0027], [0050], [0094]-[0095], [0173], [0306]);

transmitting the encryption code from the key device to a vehicle storage unit and temporarily storing the transmitted encryption code in the vehicle storage unit (Reiser; paragraphs [0075]-[0076], [0311]);

transmitting, from the vehicle storage unit to an in-vehicle telematics unit and from the in-vehicle telematics unit to a “command center”(reads on “call center”), the temporarily stored encryption code in response to an emergency event (Reiser; Abstract, paragraphs [0050], [0075]-[0076], [0114], [0173], [0176], [0311]);

transmitting the encryption code from the call center to an emergency personnel (Reiser; paragraphs [0050], [0173], [0176], [0195]); and

accessing, via the emergency personnel, the medical information from the database using the encryption code (Reiser; paragraphs [0050], [0173], [0176], [0195]).

(B) As per newly added claim 20, Reiser teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 11 above

wherein prior to storing the encryption code in the key device, the method further comprises:

associating the encryption code with the medical information of the vehicle user (Reiser; Figure 2B, Item 255, paragraphs [0026]-[0027], [0050], [0094]-[0095], [0173], [0306]);

storing the encryption code in the database (Reiser; Figure 2B, Item 255, paragraphs [0026]-[0027], [0050], [0094]-[0095], [0173], [0306]); and

transferring the encryption code from the database to the key device (Reiser; paragraphs [0075], [0114], [0287]).

(C) As per newly amended claim 13, Reiser teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claims 11 and 20 above

wherein the transferring of the encryption code from the database to the key device is accomplished using a local short range wireless network or a wired connection (Reiser; paragraphs [0044], [0084], [0290], [0295]-[0297]).

(D) As per newly added claim 22, Reiser teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 11 above

wherein the encryption code is temporarily stored in the vehicle storage unit i) while a vehicle ignition is operating; or ii) for a predetermined amount of time after the vehicle ignition is turned off (Reiser; paragraphs [0075]-[0076], [0311]-[0312]).

(E) Claim 1 differs from method claim 11, in that it is a system rather than a method for providing medical information of a vehicle user.

System claims 1-3 repeat the subject matter of claims 11, 13, 11, respectively, as a set of elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claims 11 and 13 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of Reiser in the above rejection of claims 11 and 13, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by Reiser includes the apparatus to

perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claims 11 and 13, and incorporated herein.

(F) As per newly amended claim 9, Reiser teaches a system as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above

wherein the key device comprises a key including an embedded microchip having a persistent memory storage for storing the encryption code (Reiser; paragraph [0095]).

(G) System claim 17 repeats the subject matter of claim 1, respectively, as a set of “means-plus-function” elements rather than a series of system elements. As the underlying elements of claim 1 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the teachings of Reiser in the above rejections of claim 1, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by Reiser includes the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claim 1, and incorporated herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rieser et al., (2001/0034223), as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of McCalmont et al., (2003/0109245).

(A) As per newly amended claim 16, Reiser teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 11 above.

Although Reiser teaches “[t]he data base record contains personal identification information about the person to whom the transmitter was issued, such as the person's name, address, and medical history ... [...] ...” (Reiser; [0050]) Reiser fails to explicitly disclose wherein the medical information comprises medical records of the vehicle user.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by McCalmont.

In particular, McCalmont teaches a method wherein the medical information comprises medical records of the vehicle “occupant”(reads on “user”) (McCalmont; paragraphs [0047], [0057]-[0058], [0060]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Reiser to include these limitations, as taught by McCalmont, with the motivations of providing an emergency triage service to vehicle occupants over a “wide geographic area” whereby “a request for emergency services initiated by a personal medical alarm may include identifying information that allows the call center 212 to retrieve information from the call center database 264 regarding preexisting medical conditions” (McCalmont; Abstract, paragraph [0060]).

(B) System claim 19, repeats the subject matter of claim 16, respectively, as a set of elements rather than a series of steps. As the underlying processes of claim 16 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the combined teachings of Reiser and McCalmont in the above rejection of claim 16, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed collectively by Reiser and McCalmont includes the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for method claim 16, and incorporated herein.

6. Claims 7, 10, 18, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rieser et al., (2001/0034223), as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Treyz et al., (6526335).

(A) As per newly added claim 21, Reiser teaches a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 11 above.

Reiser fails to explicitly disclose a method wherein after storing the encryption code in the key device, the method further comprises initiating an ignition cycle of the vehicle.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Treyz.

In particular, Treyz teaches a method

wherein after storing the encryption code in the key device, the method further comprises initiating an ignition cycle of the vehicle (Treyz; column 23, lines 23-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Reiser to include these limitations, as taught by Treyz, with the motivations of providing an "improved automobile personal computer system ... [...] ..." and

to “ensure security when controlling an automobile over a wireless link” (Treyz; column 1, lines 20-22, column 2, lines 45-47).

(B) As per newly amended claim 10, Reiser teaches a system as analyzed and discussed in claims 1 and 3 above above.

Reiser fails to explicitly disclose a system further comprising: a biometric sensor located on the key fob and operably connected to the controller, the biometric sensor for sensing biometric data of at least one vehicle user.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Treyz.

In particular, Treyz teaches a system further comprising: a biometric sensor located on the key fob and operably connected to the controller, the biometric sensor for sensing biometric data of at least one vehicle user (Treyz; column 15, lines 9-18).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Reiser and Treyz are as given in the rejection of claim 21 above, and incorporated herein.

(C) System claim 18 repeats the subject matter of claim 10, respectively, as a set of “means-plus-function” elements rather than a series of system elements. As the underlying elements of claim 10 have been shown to be fully disclosed by the combined teachings of Reiser and Treyz in the above rejections of claim 10, it is readily apparent that the system disclosed by Reiser and Treyz includes the apparatus to perform these functions. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 10, and incorporated herein.

(D) As per newly amended claim 7, Reiser teaches a system as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above.

Reiser fails to explicitly disclose a system further comprising: a plurality of sensors for detecting damage to the vehicle during the emergency event, the plurality of sensors operably connected to the telematics unit, wherein when the emergency event occurs, at least one of the plurality of sensors sends a signal to the telematics unit indicating that the emergency event has occurred.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Treyz.

In particular, Treyz teaches a system further comprising:

a plurality of sensors for detecting damage to the vehicle during the emergency event, the plurality of sensors operably connected to the telematics unit, wherein when the emergency event occurs, at least one of the plurality of sensors sends a signal to the telematics unit indicating that the emergency event has occurred (Treyz; Figure 4, Figure 32, column 16, line 53 to column 17, line 12, column 34, lines 24-45).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Reiser and Treyz are as given in the rejection of claim 21 above, and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied references Williams, U.S. Patent Number 7099835, Lepkofker, U.S. Patent Number 5652570, Neher, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0026240, Reed et al., U.S. Patent Number 6524239, Chen et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0130446, Rigo et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0049535, Macfarlane, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0231550, Suman et al., U.S. Patent Number 6028537, Lu et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0250468, Weisshaar et al., U.S. Patent Number 6757262 and the articles teach the environment of transmitting codes and medical information from mobile devices.

The new Volvo concept car reaps the benefits of Fingerprint Card technology. 2001. [Retrieved on March 11, 2009]. Retrieved from Internet.URL: <<http://www.fingerprints.com/Investor%20relations/News%20and%20Events/2001/The%20new%20Volvo%20concept%20car%20reaps%20the%20benefits%20of%20Fingerprint%20Card%20technology.aspx>>.

Volvo Personal Communicator. 2001. [Retrieved on March 10, 2009]. Retrieved from Internet.URL: <<http://www.fingerprints.com/Investor%20relations/News%20and%20Events/2001/Volvo%20Personal%20Communicator.aspx>>.

Press Release: Roadside Telematics Corp. Selects Kivera as Location-Based Services Partner; Kivera and Roadside Offer First Location-Based, Emergency Response Solution to Customers. 2001. [Retrieved on March 15, 2009]. Retrieved from Internet.URL:

<<http://www.directionsmag.com/press.releases/index.php?duty=Show&id=4133&trv=1>>.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300.

For formal communications, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE".

11. For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" on the front page of the communication and do NOT sign the communication. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (571) 272-6774. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6:30 Monday - Thursday and alternate Fridays.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-6787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

/N. A. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 3686
March 15, 2009

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3686